

## Exhibit 300: Part I: Summary Information and Justification (All Capital Assets)

## I.A. Overview

<b>1. Date of Submission:</b>	7/14/2006
<b>2. Agency:</b>	Department of State
<b>3. Bureau:</b>	Resource Management
<b>4. Name of this Capital Asset:</b>	Joint Planning and Performance System (JPPS, formerly CFPS)
<b>5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)</b>	014-00-01-01-01-1148-00
<b>6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&amp;M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&amp;M. These investments should indicate their current status.)</b>	Mixed Life Cycle
<b>7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?</b>	FY2001 or earlier

**8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:**

The driving business need of the Joint Planning and Performance System (JPPS) is the significant requirement for more integrated, flexible, and timely planning systems, data, and processes within, and across, State and USAID. These joint capabilities are required to support our Joint Strategic Plan and our ability to manage performance and accomplish budget and performance integration within, and across, the two organizations. Current mission, bureau, and Department planning processes in both agencies are yearly, one-time events given existing processes and systems. A joint State/USAID system that integrates resource and performance information at the program level and enables more flexible and frequent entry of data will provide more timely and accurate data for decision makers and further strengthen State/USAID support of the President's Management Agenda in terms of budget and performance integration, improved financial performance, expanded electronic government, and strategic management of human capital. JPPS will enable executives, program managers, and support personnel at all organizational levels to develop, formulate, monitor, and manage the execution of performance plans and their supporting budgets. JPPS will directly link budgetary and performance information, and ensure consistency in essential performance planning, budgeting, and information tracking by using a central data repository to integrate planning and budgeting. JPPS will also provide this essential information to support organization and program managers agency-wide, and will provide State's and USAID's bureaus with better and less costly management information. The improvements sought will enhance financial managers' ability to manage resources and improve performance. JPPS will also enable the vertical integration of Headquarters', bureaus', missions' financial and operational functions by linking and standardizing their data collection systems and by establishing closely integrated management. JPPS will enable policy guidance to be easily communicated, using consolidated, web-based data call processing and data access, to facilitate data collection and database use by stakeholders worldwide. Under the modular approach described above, the Department began deployment of JPPS modules in FY 2003.

<b>9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?</b>	Yes
<b>a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?</b>	8/4/2006
<b>10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?</b>	Yes
<b>12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.</b>	No
<b>a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?</b>	Yes

<b>b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)</b>	No
<b>1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?</b>	
<b>2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?</b>	
<b>3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?</b>	
<b>13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?</b>	Yes
<b>If "yes," check all that apply:</b>	Human Capital, Budget Performance Integration, Financial Performance, Expanded E-Government
<b>13a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?</b>	JPPS is a critical element of State's and USAID's OMB approved work plan on the President's Management Agenda. JPPS is directly aligned with the President's Management Agenda Government-wide Initiative 5, Budget and Performance Integration, and Government-wide Initiative 3, Improved Financial Performance. JPPS will be used to develop annual performance plans that include budget and human resources information, and to link actual performance, results, and costs to strategic goals.
<b>14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit <a href="http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part">www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part</a>.)</b>	No
<b>a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?</b>	No
<b>b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool?</b>	
<b>c. If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?</b>	
<b>15. Is this investment for information technology?</b>	Yes
<b>If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technology?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do not answer this sub-section.</b>	
<b>For information technology investments only:</b>	
<b>16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)</b>	Level 2
<b>17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance):</b>	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
<b>18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?</b>	No
<b>19. Is this a financial management system?</b>	Yes
<b>a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMI compliance area?</b>	Yes
<b>1. If "yes," which compliance area:</b>	Improved financial management; Timely and useful information
<b>2. If "no," what does it address?</b>	
<b>b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update</b>	

**required by Circular A-11 section 52**

Joint Planning and Performance System (JPPS)

**20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)**

<b>Hardware</b>	0
<b>Software</b>	50
<b>Services</b>	50
<b>Other</b>	0
<b>21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?</b>	N/A
<b>23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?</b>	Yes

**I.D. Performance Information**

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

**Performance Information Table 1:**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Strategic Goal(s) Supported</b>	<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)</b>	<b>Planned Performance Metric (Target)</b>	<b>Performance Metric Results (Actual)</b>
2002	Strategic Goal 12: Management and Organizational Excellence: Ensure a high quality workforce supported by modern and secure infrastructure and operational capacities/ Resource Management	Functional and Technical Requirements and Business Model Concept. Verify conformance of functional and technical requirements; business model concept developed for CFPS and standards for conducting pilot with EAP Bureau with functional	No functional or technical requirements developed for CFPS.	Functional and technical requirements and business model for CFPS and standards for conducting pilot program must be 100% compliant with functional requirements for headquarters', bureaus', and missions' planning and budgeting processes.	Functional and technical requirements and business model for CFPS and standards for conducting pilot program are 100% compliant with functional requirements for headquarters', bureaus', and missions' planning and budgeting processes.

		requirements of headquarters', bureaus', and missions' planning and budgeting processes.			
2003	Strategic Goal 12: Management and Organizational Excellence: Ensure a high quality workforce supported by modern and secure infrastructure and operational capacities/ Resource Management	Develop/ Deploy Bureau Performance Plan (Version 1). Develop an automated Bureau Performance Plan database that successfully interfaces with the automated MPP system to share and analyze information across databases.	Currently, manual development of Bureau Performance Plans and some automation of budget requests.	Bureaus enter all BPP data requests through automated system thus reducing the manual staff time to develop performance plan and budget request. All of the required MPP budget data is aggregated in the BPP system for use by the bureaus and RM.	Bureaus entered 100% of BPP data through the automated BPP system. Automated system reduced manual staff time by pre-populating prior year data into the system and by aggregating and pre-populating 100% of data from automated MPP system.
2003	Strategic Goal 12: Management and Organizational Excellence: Ensure a high quality workforce supported by modern and secure infrastructure and operational capacities/ Resource Management	Develop/ Deploy Statement of Net Costs and Accounting Interface. Provide a methodology to associate current and prior year accounting costs and revenues to strategic goals, and is used to produce the annual Statement of Net Costs.	Currently, no agreed upon methodology for Statement of Net Costs.	All spending control levels in CRMS can be accurately correlated by goal with the costs from CFMS.	Module initiated on April 21 and on schedule to have 100% of spending control levels in CRMS accurately correlated by goal with costs from CFMS by September delivery date.
2003	Strategic Goal 12: Management and Organizational Excellence: Ensure a high quality workforce supported by modern and secure infrastructure and operational capacities/ Resource Management	Develop/ Deploy Mission Performance Plan (Version 1). Provide missions with a standard system to develop, submit for approval, and monitor annual performance plans in order to eliminate multiple local systems, reduce redundant data calls, ensure consistency, and improve relating budget to performance.	Currently, manual development of Mission Performance Plans and with some automation of budget requests.	Missions and posts enter all MPP data request through automated MPP system thus reducing the manual staff time to develop performance plan and budget request.	Missions and posts entered 100% of MPP data request through the automated MPP system. Automated system reduced manual staff time by prepopulating prior year data into the system, whereas in prior years missions needed to reenter this data manually.
2004	Strategic Goal 12: Management and Organizational Excellence: Ensure a high quality workforce supported by modern and secure infrastructure and operational capacities/ Resource Management	Develop/Deploy Bureau Resource Management System. Develop an online systematic capability for missions and bureaus to develop, submit for approval, and monitor resource decisions and financial performance against requests and approved spending plans.	Currently, budget and cost data developed and maintained offline, and reported manually by posts, missions and bureaus.	Bureaus utilize the common system to develop and monitor financial status.	Module initiated and scheduled for 20% of bureaus to utilize this system by September 2004.
2004	Strategic Goal 12: Management and Organizational Excellence: Ensure a high quality workforce supported by modern and secure infrastructure and operational capacities/ Resource Management	Develop/ Deploy Planning and Performance Module (Version 1). Provides digital summarized dashboards that facilitate managerial decision-making.	Currently budget, accounting, and performance systems are not interconnected.	Dashboard reports that extract content from current budgeting, and performance databases provide relevant and up-to-date information.	Module initiated and on schedule to provide 80% of the dashboard reports from current databases in October 2004.
2005	Strategic Goal 12: Management and Organizational Excellence: Ensure a high quality workforce	As part of Planning and Performance Reporting Module, automate the publication of an	State and USAID manually produce separate Agency Performance Plans. No joint	State, potentially with USAID produces an Agency Performance Plan, automating	State produced a partially automated Agency Performance Plan, which improved the

	supported by modern and secure infrastructure and operational capacities/ Resource Management	Agency Performance Plan, potentially with USAID, in addition to other Dashboard reports that integrate State and USAID budget, planning and performance data.	reporting on budget, planning, and performance data.	the collection of data and other integrated reports.	integrity and accuracy of the data among other State systems.
2005	Strategic Goal 12: Management and Organizational Excellence: Ensure a high quality workforce supported by modern and secure infrastructure and operational capacities/ Resource Management.	Develop/Deploy Bureau Resource Management System. Develop an online systematic capability for missions and bureaus to develop, submit for approval, and monitor resource decisions and financial performance against requests and approved spending plans.	Currently, budget and cost data developed and maintained offline, and reported manually by posts, missions and bureaus.	Bureaus utilize the common system to develop and monitor financial status and budget requests.	This will not begin until FY 06 budget execution. Due to the timing of the budget cycle, BRMS will be utilized to produce the FY 08 budget request.

**All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at [www.egov.gov](http://www.egov.gov).**

Performance Information Table 2:							
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2005	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Availability	Availability: Platform downtime	Longest unscheduled break in service exceeded 48 hours during peak MPP demand (Dec. to Feb.)	No unscheduled breaks in service exceed 48 hours during peak demand (Dec. to Feb.)	No unscheduled breaks have extended beyond 48 hours.
2005	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Budget and Performance Integration	Strategic Planning: Dashboard Usage	Dashboard launched	5% of bureau planning teams use the Dashboard in preparation for Senior Reviews.	%5 (2 bureaus out of 38) within State have used the Dashboard in prepare for Senior Reviews.
2005	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Errors/Complaints: Create MPP help desk tracking system	No system exists to track MPP help desk calls, account creation, etc.	Create Help desk and metrics to enable improved customer support.	Help Desk created, 7,770 MPP help desk issues reported in FY2005.
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Response Time	Response time: Create system to track Publisher delays	No system exists to measure the end users delays caused by the Publisher.	Create metrics to measure Publisher delays.	Metrics created, 5% of publisher requests take > 8 hours to process during periods of peak demand (Dec. â€" Feb.)
2006	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Availability: Platform downtime	Longest unscheduled break in service exceeded 48 hours during peak MPP demand (Dec. â€" Feb.)	No unscheduled breaks in service exceed 40 hours during peak demand (Dec. â€" Feb.)	No unscheduled breaks in service exceeded 40 hours during peak demand (Dec â€" Feb)
2006	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Budget and Performance Integration	Strategic Planning: Dashboard Usage	Dashboard launched.	10% of bureau planning teams use the Dashboard in preparation for Senior Reviews.	The Dashboard has been rolled out to all bureaus. Senior Reviews are scheduled to take place in mid-July through early

							August.
2006	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Budget Formulation	Strategic Planning: Automation of planning documents	JPP and PAR are manually produced.	Partial (10%) automation of JPP and PAR via the exchange of CD's between applications.	80% automation of the JPP was completed, and PAR automation has begun via CD transfer.
2006	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Errors/Complaints: MPP Helpdesk tickets	7,770 MPP tickets	Less 1,500 MPP tickets	Less 2,590 tickets (Less is better.)
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Response time: Publisher delays	5% of publisher requests took > 8 hours to process during periods of peak demand (Dec. - Feb.)	1% of publisher requests take > 8 hours to process during periods of peak demand (Dec. - Feb.)	1% of publisher requests took greater than 8 hours to process.
2007	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Availability: Platform downtime	Longest unscheduled break in service exceeded 48 hours during peak MPP demand (Dec. - Feb.)	No unscheduled breaks in service exceed 32 hours during peak demand (Dec. - Feb.)	
2007	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Budget and Performance Integration	Strategic Planning: Dashboard Usage	Dashboard launched.	25% of bureau planning teams use the Dashboard in preparation for Senior Reviews.	
2007	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Budget Formulation	Strategic Planning: Automation of planning documents	JPP and PAR are manually produced.	85% automation of the JPP and 25% automation of the PAR.	
2007	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Errors/Complaints: MPP Helpdesk tickets	7,770 MPP tickets	Less 2,600 MPP tickets	
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Response time: Publisher delays	5% of publisher requests took > 8 hours to process during periods of peak demand (Dec. - Feb.)	No publisher requests take > 8 hours to process during periods of peak demand (Dec. - Feb.)	
2008	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Access	Availability: Platform downtime	Longest unscheduled break in service exceeded 48 hours during peak MPP demand (Dec. - Feb.)	No unscheduled breaks in service exceed 25 hours during peak demand (Dec. - Feb.)	
2008	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Budget and Performance Integration	Strategic Planning: Dashboard Usage	Dashboard launched.	50% of bureau planning teams use the Dashboard in preparation for Senior Reviews.	
2008	Mission and Business Results	Planning and Resource Allocation	Budget Formulation	Strategic Planning: Automation of planning documents	JPP and PAR are manually produced.	Complete automation of the JPP and 50% automation of the PAR.	
2008	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Errors/Complaints: MPP Helpdesk tickets	7,770 MPP tickets	Less 2,900 MPP tickets	
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Response time: Publisher delays	5% of publisher requests took > 8 hours to process during periods of peak demand (Dec. - Feb.)	No publisher requests take > 6 hours to process during periods of peak demand (Dec. - Feb.)	

## I.E. Security and Privacy

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

All systems supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system/s to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system/s.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment:	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year:	4
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.	Yes

5. Have any weaknesses related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?	No
a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated agency's plan of action and milestone process?	No
6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?	No
a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.	

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

Name of System	Is this a new system?	Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?	Is the PIA available to the public?	Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?	Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06?
Dashboard	No	No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
Joint Planning and Performance System	Yes	No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.
MPP/BPP	No	No, because even though it has personal identifying information, the system contains information solely about federal employees and agency contractors.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

## I.F. Enterprise Architecture (EA)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture? Yes

a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy? Yes

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment. JPPS

b. If "no," please explain why?

### 3. Service Reference Model (SRM) Table:

Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/>.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	FEA Service Component Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
Back Office Services		Back Office Services	Data Management	Data Warehouse			No Reuse	10
Back Office Services		Back Office Services	Human Capital / Workforce Management	Resource Planning and Allocation			No Reuse	5
Business Analytical Services		Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	10
Business Management Services		Business Management Services	Investment Management	Performance Management			No Reuse	20
Business Management Services		Business Management Services	Investment Management	Strategic Planning and Mgmt			No Reuse	55

Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI)

code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

#### 4. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:

To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Issue Management, Serena
Data Warehouse	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	SQL Server, Microsoft
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Defect Tracking, Serena
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	Deployment Management, Serena
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Business Cycle Testing, Serena
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Performance Profiling, Mercury
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Reliability Testing, Mercury
Performance Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Security and Access Control Testing, Mercury

Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

No

a. If "yes," please describe.

6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?

No

a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a

specific web browser version)?

1. If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).

## Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information

### II.A. Alternatives Analysis

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A- 94 for all investments, and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments, to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?	7/1/2005
b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?	
c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:	

#### 4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

JPPS will avoid incremental costs and significantly improve the efficiency of the planning and budgeting processes. It avoids costs by obviating the need to add personnel at the headquarters, bureau, and mission levels to manually perform those functions necessary to bring State into regulatory and legislative compliance. JPPS complies with the FY 2003 OMB Passback guidance, FFMIA, GPRA, the CFO Act, the Clinger-Cohen Act, and OMB circulars A-127, and A-130. The primary benefits of JPPS are to enable further performance and budget integration, improve resource management, and facilitate interagency coordination of programs and resources. JPPS will: - Integrate mission and bureau level budget formulation and strategic performance planning activities within State and across State and USAID - Improve the quality of State's budget and performance plans - Increase the effectiveness of resource utilization within State and USAID - Enable operational efficiencies through greater cross-agency access to information - Improve the efficiency of budget and performance plan formulation, preparation, and execution - Decrease the amount of time it takes to produce requisite documents, such as the Performance Accountability Report, Joint Performance Plan, and Foreign Operations Congressional Budget Justification (PAR, JPP, and CBJ), as well as improve the accuracy of data presented within them - Enhance reporting and analysis capabilities to provide insight into resources utilized to achieve strategic objectives - Improve manual and non-standard Bureau performance planning and budgeting capabilities - Implement improved business practices, common performance indicators within State, and enhanced performance indicators between State and USAID - Transform the planning and budgeting system of record into a dynamic knowledge management system that is used throughout the year - Enable improved integration of planning and resource information with accounting data - Enable the discrete recording of qualitative performance indicators alongside quantitative indicators - Enable "off-line" data entry capability for performance and budget information - Integrate data entry sections related to budget performance planning information

### II.B. Risk Management

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

<b>1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?</b>	Yes
<b>a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?</b>	7/15/2005
<b>b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?</b>	No

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

<b>2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?</b>	No
<b>a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?</b>	
<b>b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?</b>	

N/A - There is a risk management plan for the project.

**3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:**

The investment risk was taken into consideration during the development of the alternatives analysis and the life cycle cost estimate. For the alternative analysis, risk was consider and compared across the four alternatives. During the alternative analysis, the level of risk was part of the selection criteria and was factored into the potential costs of each alternative. In developing the life cycle cost estimate for the selected alternative, the cost and probability of the main risks were taken into consideration. First, risks were identified. For each of these risks, the cost (dollars or time) and probability of occuring were determined. Based on the cost and probability of the risks, the life cycle costs were adjusted. This risk analysis will be an on-going process with the list of risks and their associated cost and probabilities under constant review.